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Ethical Procedure. APS reviewers have a responsibility to report suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or concerns about animal or human experimentation to the Editor. A reviewer may recognize and report that he/she is refereeing, or has recently refereed, a similar or identical paper for another journal by the same author. Readers who report that they have seen the same article elsewhere, or authors may see their own published work being plagiarized. In all cases we address ethical concerns diligently following an issue-specific standard practice as summarized below. The first action of the journal Editor is to inform the Publications Committee Chair through the Director of Publications by supplying copies of 1) the relevant material and 2) a draft letter to the corresponding author asking for an explanation in a nonjudgmental manner. The Publications Committee Chair must approve any correspondence before it is sent to the author. If the author’s explanation is unacceptable and it seems that serious unethical conduct has taken place, the matter is referred to the Publications Committee. After deliberation, the Committee will decide whether the case is sufficiently serious to warrant a ban on future submissions to, and serving as a reviewer for, APS journals and/or if the offending author’s institution should be informed. The decision has to be approved by the Executive Cabinet of the APS Council, and the author has the right to appeal a sanction, with the opportunity to present his/her position, to the Publications Committee and the full APS Council.
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